



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,853	11/19/2001	John Teloh	SMQ-082CN1/P6396CNT 9384	
959 7	7590 11/01/2004		EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET			BETIT, JACOB F	
BOSTON, MA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			DATE MAILED: 11/01/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/988,853	TELOH ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jacob F. Betit	2164
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 30 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	•
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the second content of the	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply the shortened statutory period for shortened statutor	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
<ul> <li>(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C</li> <li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's</li> </ul>	FR 1.704(b).	
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		f the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	·	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· / <del></del>	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		•
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	SAM RIMELL
10. Other:		PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants arguments Sicola et al. does not teach "the step of grouping two data structures held by a storage device locally accessing a first electronic device" and Sicola et al. does not teach "a step of instructing the first data replication facility to generate a replica of the selected data based on the tracked changes to the one or more locations of the first storage medium were both addressed in the final office action and were not deemed purswasive.